

REMARKS

Applicants add new claims 19 and 20. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0031269 to Toshikazu Fukushima (Toshikazu). But contrary to what the Examiner states, Toshikazu fails to disclose “for each toponym ...using the identified geo-textual correlations to generate a value for a confidence that the selected toponym refers to a corresponding geographic location,” as required by the claim. Instead, Toshikazu teaches for a specific reading of a toponym, using relationships between that specific reading and text associated with that specific reading to resolve an ambiguity in the geographical location that is implied by that specific reading of the toponym. The difference is a fundamental one, as we explain below.

Claim 1 requires at least two steps. In one step, it requires identifying geo-textual correlations in a large corpus among readings of toponyms that are found within the corpus. In another step, it requires using the results of the first step (i.e., the identified correlations) to generate a confidence that a particular toponym refers to a corresponding geographic location. In other words, the claim requires that we generate a confidence that the toponym, in contrast to a specific reading of the toponym, refers to a corresponding geographic location. This feature of the claim is completely absent from Toshikazu.

Toshikazu does not teach using a corpus of documents to generate a confidence that a toponym itself, regardless of where it might be located within a text, corresponds to a particular geographic location. Rather, he resolves ambiguities in the geographic location referred to by a specific reading of a toponym. He does this by searching for ambiguity-resolving words in a set of pages linked to the page containing the specific toponym reading. First he searches a set of pages connected by a single link to the page containing the specific reading of the toponym (§§ [0068] – [0081]). If such pages do not contain sufficient information to resolve the ambiguity, he expands “...to search across plural link layers (hierarchies) for the co-occurring words.” (§ [0082]) Thus Toshikazu conducts a search within a specific set of pages that he selects for the specific reading of the toponym in order to resolve an ambiguity in the geographical location

referred to by that specific reading of the toponym. Nowhere does he even hint at generating a confidence that a toponym refers to a particular geographic location regardless of its textual location, as required by the claim.


Independent claims 10 and 18 each contain limitations that are analogous to those of claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant believes that claims 10 and 18, and dependent claims 2-9 and 11-17 are not anticipated by Toshikazu.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fees are believed to be due with this reply; however, please charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayments, to our Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 23, 2007


Oliver B. R. Strimpel
Registration No.: 56,451
Attorney for Applicant

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 526-6000 (telephone)
(617) 526-5000 (facsimile)